

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-4 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action at page 2, numbered item 2, claims 1, 2, and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a confirmation unit formed in a part of said computer, said confirmation unit evaluating accuracy of said information and forming accuracy information, said accuracy information indicating whether contents of the plurality of items received by the business information reception unit are accurate." Claim 2 has been amended to recite "evaluating accuracy of information provided at said computer from a user terminal connected to said electronic network over said electronic network indicating whether a plurality of items, which are included in purchase information supplied from the registered member, are accurate." Claim 4 has been amended to recite "the computer evaluating accuracy of the information and providing accuracy information indicating whether a plurality of items of information provided by the registered member are accurate." In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§102(a) or 103(a)

In the Office Action at pages 3-5, numbered item 5, claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,009,412 to Storey. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

At pages 3-4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner addressed independent method claims 4 and 2, which have similar limitations.

Amended independent claim 4 is directed to a method for managing a number of points attributed to registered members of a group in accordance with registered member point files stored in a computer connected to a network. Claim 4 has been amended to recite "the computer connected to the network receiving information provided by the registered member from a user terminal connected to the electronic network" and "the computer evaluating accuracy of the information and providing accuracy information indicating whether a plurality of items of information provided by the registered member are accurate." Support for the amendments to independent claim 4 can be found in the originally filed Specification, at least in Fig. 4.

Amended independent claim 2 is directed to a business information managing method for managing points attributed to a registered member in a computer in accordance with a registered member point file held in said computer, said computer being connected to an electronic network that is carried out by a computer. Claim 2 has been amended to recite "evaluating accuracy of information provided from a user terminal connected to said electronic network over said electronic network indicating whether a plurality of items, which are included in purchase information supplied from the registered member, are accurate." Support for the amendments to independent claim 4 can be found in the originally filed Specification, at least in Fig. 4.

Thus, both independent method claims 4 and 2 have been amended to clarify that the information provided by the registered members is evaluated to determine whether or not the information is accurate. Applicant respectfully submits that, while Storey describes the management of a point file, Storey fails to teach or suggest evaluating the accuracy of information provided from a user terminal, as recited in amended independent claims 4 and 2. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Storey fails to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claims 4 and 2 and, therefore, claims 4 and 2 are in condition for allowance.

At pages 4-5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner addressed independent method claims 1 and 3, which have similar limitations.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a business information managing system.

Specifically, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "a confirmation unit formed in a part of said computer, said confirmation unit evaluating accuracy of said information and forming accuracy information, said accuracy information indicating whether contents of the plurality of items received by the business information reception unit are accurate." Support for the amendments to independent claim 1 can be found in the originally filed Specification, at least in Fig. 4.

Amended independent claim 3 is directed to a system for managing business information of registered members. Independent claim 3 has been amended to recite "an evaluation unit connected to said network, said evaluation unit evaluating the accuracy of information provided by registered members over used terminals" and "a point accumulation unit connected to said network, said point accumulation unit adjusting points earned by registered members based on whether information sent from user terminals by registered members is confirmed by the evaluation unit." Support for the amendments to independent claim 3 can be found in the originally filed Specification, at least in Fig. 4.

Thus, both independent method claims 1 and 3 have been amended to clarify that the information provided by the registered members is evaluated to determine whether or not the information is accurate. Applicant respectfully submits that, while Storey describes the management of a point file, Storey fails to teach or suggest evaluating the accuracy of information provided from a user terminal, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 3. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Storey fails to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claims 1 and 3 and, therefore, claims 1 and 3 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

Serial No. 09/817,225

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

May 19, 2005

By:

David M. Pitcher

David M. Pitcher

Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501